



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,576	02/22/2002	Peter Stutz	770P010688-US (PAR)	1984
2512	7590	01/18/2006	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ERB, NATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3639	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/081,576	STUTZ, PETER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Erb	3639	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 14 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 May 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-26-2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 3-26-2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires the following: (1) a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office; (2) U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications listed in a section separately from citations of other documents; (3) the application number of the application in which the information disclosure statement is being submitted on each page of the list; (4) a column that provides a blank space next to each document to be considered, for the examiner's initials; and (5) a heading that clearly indicates that the list is an information disclosure statement.

Not every page of the information disclosure statement is labeled with the applicant's application number, as required by 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1)(i). Not every page of the information disclosure statement includes a heading indicating that it is an information disclosure statement, as required by 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1)(iii). The information disclosure statement fails to disclose each inventor for each U.S. patent application listed, as required by 37 CFR 1.98(b)(3). However, the information disclosure statement has been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "22" has been used to designate both the Internet and a LAN. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

Art Unit: 3639

being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The Internet appears to have been intended to be labeled "23." Changing the label of the Internet on the drawings from "22" to "23" should correct this problem.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 12 (p. 5, line 31), 20A (p. 5, line 9), and 20B (p. 5, line 10). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 12A (Figure 1), 12B (Figure 1), 15 (Figure 1), 10D (Figure 2), N3 (Figure 2), N5 (Figure 2), V1 (Figure 2), V2 (Figure 2), and V3 (Figure 2). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance

Art Unit: 3639

with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. On p. 5, line 9, "20A" should be --10A--. Note this will also correct the 20A problem noted in section 3 above.
 - b. On p. 5, line 10, "20B" should be --10B--. Note this will also correct the 20B problem noted in section 3 above.
 - c. On p. 5, line 21, the phrase "other tan including mailpieces" is unclear and appears to be a typographical error.
 - d. On p. 7, lines 2, 5, and 25, the reference number 22 is referred to using three different terms, "vendor's web server," "LAN," and "vendors web site."
 - e. On p. 7, line 17, "system" should be --franking machine--.
 - f. On p. 8, line 10, "feature" should be --features--.
 - g. On p. 9, line 4, please remove the second occurrence of the phrase "to the." It appears to be a typographical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. The use of the trademark POWERPOST has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

7. The use of the trademark BLUETOOTH has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

8. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: “universal” should be replaced by --uniform--. Appropriate correction is required.
9. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 is a duplicate of claim 11. Appropriate correction is required.
10. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: The second occurrence of the phrase “franking system” on the first line of the claim appears to be a typographical error. It appears to have been intended to read --franking machine--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the network node" in the second line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the vendor" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the franking machine" in lines 4-5 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Note that making the correction suggested in section 10 above would correct this problem.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

16. Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leon, U.S. Patent No. 6,381,589 B1, hereinafter referred to as Leon 1.

As per **Claim 1**, Leon 1 discloses a franking system comprising:

- a network controller (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al., Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fourth Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, 1999, p. 111, defines a controller as “A device on which other systems rely for access to a computer subsystem. A disk controller, for example, controls access to one or more disk drives, managing physical and logical access to the drive or drives.”

Therefore, a network controller controls access to a network, and any computer attached to a network must have a network controller. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses a network controller.);

- and protocol stack software (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al., p. 363, defines a protocol stack as “The set of protocols that work together on different levels to enable communication on a network.” In column 7, 1st full paragraph, Leon 1 discloses a computer using communications software, the type of software that would manage a computer’s network communications. Therefore, any computer connected to a network would have to deal with a protocol stack, and Leon 1 discloses using software to perform such functions. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses protocol stack software.);

- that allows the franking system to be connected to a local area network (Leon 1, column 4, lines 47-49);

- and communicate to any other system coupled to the local area network (Leon 1, Figure 1).

As per **Claim 10**, Leon 1 further discloses wherein the network controller is further adapted to couple the franking system to a wide area network ("WAN") (column 4, lines 47-49).

As per **Claim 13**, Leon 1 further discloses wherein the WAN is a Satellite network (column 4, lines 44-49).

As per **Claim 16**, Leon 1 discloses a franking system including:

- modules coupled in series (Woodcock et al., p. 295, defines a module as “a collection of routines and data structures that performs a particular task or implements a particular abstract data type.” In column 7, 1st full paragraph, Leon 1 discloses software being used to accomplish the functions of the system. Software contains modules. Leon 1, column 2, 1st full paragraph, discloses the system performing functions, step-by-step, that is, in series. Therefore, the modules that execute those functions in Leon 1 must be coupled in series.);
- within a configuration authorized by the vendor (Leon 1 inherently discloses this; certainly the vendor would not participate in a system which operated in a way in which the vendor did not approve.);
- and including a node controller (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al., p. 312, defines a node as a device that is connected to a network and is capable of communicating with other network devices. So, the local computer in Leon 1 is a node. Woodcock et al., p. 111, defines a controller as “A device on which other systems rely for access to a computer subsystem. A disk controller, for example,

Art Unit: 3639

controls access to one or more disk drives, managing physical and logical access to the drive or drives.” Therefore, a node controller controls access to the node, and any computer attached to a network must have a node controller. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses a node controller.);

- and protocol stack software (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al., p. 363, defines a protocol stack as “The set of protocols that work together on different levels to enable communication on a network.” In column 7, 1st full paragraph, Leon 1 discloses a computer using communications software, the type of software that would manage a computer’s network communications. Therefore, any computer connected to a network would have to deal with a protocol stack, and Leon 1 discloses using software to perform such functions. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses protocol stack software.);

- for coupling the franking machine to a LAN (Leon 1, column 4, lines 47-49).

As per **Claim 19**, Leon 1 further discloses wherein the system is adapted to download funds via the local area network and an Internet connector from a secure funds server (column 10, line 26, through column 11, line 13). Also, Figure 1 of Leon 1 discloses the Internet connector.

As per **Claim 20**, Leon 1 further discloses wherein the system is adapted to be remotely controlled via the local area network by a remote system (column 5, lines 24-26 [states that a single machine can operate as both the local and host computer]; column 6, lines 28-36 [states that various parts of the system can be located in different physical locations]). If the remote

Art Unit: 3639

host computer of Figure 1 of Leon 1 also performed the functions of the local computer of that figure, then the system would be remotely controlled via the local area network by a remote system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Watt, Peggy, "Operating System-Based 'Net Gateways Invite Intruders,'" Network World, April 10, 1995, pp. 6-7. Leon 1 fails to disclose wherein the network controller is adapted to allow a peer system to be coupled to an internet connector through a gateway to the internet. Watt discloses wherein the network controller is adapted to allow a peer system to be coupled to an internet connector through a gateway to the internet (p. 1, last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking invention of Leon 1 such that the network controller is adapted to allow a peer system to be coupled to an internet connector through a gateway to the internet as disclosed by Watt. Watt provides motivation inherently because attaching a peer system to an internet connector allows the peer system to communicate with devices over the Internet.

19. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Watt in further view of Murhammer, Martin W., Lee, Kok-Keong, Motallebi, Payam, Borghi,

Art Unit: 3639

Paolo, and Wozabal, Karl, IP Network Design Guide, International Business Machines, Research Triangle Park, NC, June 21, 1999. Leon 1 fails to disclose the network controller being adapted to use a communication protocol to a peer system. Watt inherently discloses a network controller being adapted to use a communication protocol to a peer system (p. 1, last paragraph; a device on a peer-to-peer net would have to have a network controller adapted to use a communication protocol to a peer system in order to communicate with the peer-to-peer net). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking invention of Leon 1 such that the network controller is adapted to use a communication protocol to a peer system as disclosed by Watt. Watt provides motivation inherently because adapting a network controller to use a communication protocol to a peer system allows the network controller's device to communicate with a peer system. Leon 1 and Watt fail to disclose a communication protocol that includes any protocol on top of the network controller protocol stack including the protocol utilized with a system web browser. Murhammer et al. discloses a communication protocol that includes any protocol on top of the network controller protocol stack including the protocol utilized with a system web browser (Section 1.1.2, see Figure 1 and the descriptions of the Application and Network layers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the invention of Leon 1 as combined with Watt above in this section such that the communication protocol includes any protocol on top of the network controller protocol stack including the protocol utilized with a system web browser as disclosed by Murhammer et al. Murhammer et al. inherently provides motivation because such a modification allows one to use a Web browser

which can be used to view documents in the form used on the World Wide Web (Section 1.1.2, see the description of the Application layer).

20. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Carroll et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0083018 A1.

As per **Claim 4**, Leon 1 fails to disclose further including one or more URLs for identifying one or more servers that can be contacted by the system. Carroll et al. discloses including one or more URLs for identifying one or more servers that can be contacted by the system (paragraph [0024], lines 5-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that it further includes one or more URLs for identifying one or more servers that can be contacted by the system as disclosed by Carroll et al. Carroll et al. provides motivation because a URL acts as a network address that allows a system to contact a specific location on a network (paragraph [0024], lines 5-9).

As per **Claim 5**, Leon 1 further discloses wherein the network controller further includes a web browser for accessing nodes on the internet with a URL (column 5, 1st full paragraph).

21. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Sidhu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,150,464. Leon 1 discloses a franking system comprising:

- a network controller (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al. defines a controller as "A device on which other systems rely for access to a computer subsystem. A disk controller, for example, controls access

Art Unit: 3639

to one or more disk drives, managing physical and logical access to the drive or drives.”

Therefore, a network controller controls access to a network, and any computer attached to a network must have a network controller. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses a network controller.);

- and protocol stack software (Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks. Woodcock et al., p. 363, defines a protocol stack as “The set of protocols that work together on different levels to enable communication on a network.” In column 7, 1st full paragraph, Leon 1 discloses a computer using communications software, the type of software that would manage a computer’s network communications. Therefore, any computer connected to a network would have to deal with a protocol stack, and Leon 1 discloses using software to perform such functions. Thus, Leon 1 inherently discloses protocol stack software.);

- for coupling the franking system to a first LAN (Leon 1, column 4, lines 47-49);

- to a system connected to the internet (Leon 1, Figure 1).

Leon 1 fails to disclose the system being connected to the network by a second LAN. Sidhu et al. discloses a system being connected to a network by a second LAN (column 11, last paragraph, through column 12, 1st sentence of 1st full paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to connect the LAN disclosed in Leon 1 to the Internet via a second LAN as disclosed by Sidhu et al. Sidhu et al. provides motivation because that would allow more than one LAN to be connected to the network (column 11, lines 65-68).

Art Unit: 3639

22. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Sidhu et al. in further view of Woodcock et al. Leon 1 further discloses:

- using a USB to connect devices, including a printer (column 4, lines 50-54);
- using a computer as either a master or slave to outside devices (On p. 283, Woodcock et al. defines a master/slave arrangement as "A system in which one device, called the master, controls another device, called the slave." Therefore Leon 1 discloses using a computer as a master in column 9, 1st full paragraph, where the local computer transmits a print command to make a printer print. Leon 1 also discloses using a computer as a slave in column 5, lines 10-12, where it states the local computer can be a terminal.)
- a display for the system (column 5, lines 55-58);
- and a LAN node (Woodcock et al., p. 312, defines a node as a device that is connected to a network and is capable of communicating with other network devices. Leon 1 discloses a LAN, as discussed in section 21 above. A LAN is a network, and official notice is hereby taken of the fact that a network must have at least two connected devices which communicate with each other. Therefore each of those devices would be a node, and disclosing a LAN also inherently discloses a node.)

Leon 1 and Sidhu et al. do not disclose further including a universal serial bus ("USB") for coupling the system to a display, modem, keyboard and other franking system peripherals including a LAN node. As stated above, Leon 1 discloses using a USB to connect devices and discloses devices in the form of a display and a LAN node. Therefore, it would be obvious in view of those disclosures to use a USB to connect a display and to connect a LAN node. Woodcock et al. discloses using a USB to connect a system to a modem, keyboard, and other

Art Unit: 3639

peripherals (see definition of USB, p. 462). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to use the franking system of Leon 1 as modified by Sidhu et al. as discussed in section 21 above with a USB connecting the system to a modem, keyboard, and other peripherals, as disclosed by Woodcock et al. Woodcock et al. provides motivation in that same USB definition in that connecting a system to devices using a USB allows the system to transfer data with those devices.

23. Claims 8, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Leon, U.S. Patent No. 6,701,304 B2, hereinafter referred to as Leon 2.

As per **Claim 8**, Leon 1 fails to disclose wherein the network controller is adapted to couple the franking machine to a wireless network. Leon 2 discloses wherein the network controller is adapted to couple the franking machine to a wireless network (column 4, lines 31-34) (U.S. Patent 6,701,304). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that the franking machine could be coupled to a wireless network as disclosed by Leon 2. Leon 2 inherently provides motivation because a wireless network allows system to communicate without the need for wire connectors.

As per **Claim 17**, Leon 1 fails to disclose further including a configuration server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including data identifying a vendor authorized configuration for the franking module. Leon 2 discusses storing data on devices connected to the network relating to the configuration of indicia to be printed and then retrieving that data as

Art Unit: 3639

needed from those devices (column 8, line 57, through column 9, line 13). Leon 2 inherently discloses that the configuration is vendor authorized; presumably the vendor would not utilize a configuration of which the vendor did not approve. Therefore, Leon 2 discloses further including a configuration server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including data identifying a vendor authorized configuration for the franking modules. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that it further included a configuration server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including data identifying a vendor authorized configuration for the franking module as disclosed by Leon 2. Leon 2 provides motivation in stating that such a configuration server and storage device allow for data for specific indicia to be stored which can be changed for different countries, classes of mail, and indicia requirements (column 8, line 57, through column 9, line 13).

As per **Claim 18**, Leon 1 fails to disclose further including a statistical server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including franking rates of post office and commercial couriers. Leon 2 discloses further including a statistical server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including franking rates (column 7, lines 1-4). Official notice is hereby taken of the fact that the post office and commercial couriers both deliver mail, so it would be obvious to include franking rates of both in the data storage device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that it further included a statistical server coupled to the LAN and including a data storage device including franking rates of post office and commercial

Art Unit: 3639

couriers as disclosed by Leon 2 or made obvious by official notice. Leon 2 provides motivation in that the franking rates allow the host computer to determine the proper amount of postage (column 7, lines 6-9).

24. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Leon 2 in further view of Anonymous, "Wireless Cellular Phone Headset Introduced," Microwave Journal, International Edition, January 2000, p. 58. Leon 1 and Leon 2 fail to disclose wherein the wireless network is a BLUETOOTH™ wireless network device. Anonymous discloses wherein a wireless network is a BLUETOOTH™ wireless network device (entire article). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 as modified by Leon 2 as discussed in section 23 above such that the wireless network is a BLUETOOTH™ wireless network device as disclosed by Anonymous. Anonymous provides motivation in that BLUETOOTH™ is a future standard for wireless communication between devices (1st paragraph, lines 2-3). Therefore, it would be presumably advantageous to have one's network compatible with that technology.

25. Claims 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Woodcock et al.

As per **Claims 11 and 14**, Leon 1 fails to disclose wherein the WAN is an ISDN network. Woodcock et al. discloses an ISDN network (ISDN definition, pp. 249-250). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that the WAN is an ISDN network as disclosed by

Art Unit: 3639

Woodcock et al. Woodcock et al. provides motivation in that an ISDN network is high-speed (ISDN definition, p. 249).

As per **Claim 12**, Leon 1 fails to disclose wherein the WAN is a SONET network.

Woodcock et al. discloses a SONET network (SONET definition, p. 417). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that the WAN is a SONET network as disclosed by Woodcock et al. Woodcock et al. provides motivation in that a SONET network is high-speed (SONET definition, p. 417).

26. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon 1 in view of Vlosky, Richard P., Fontenot, Renee, Blalock, Lydia, "Extranets: Impacts on Business Practices and Relationships," The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 2000, Vol. 15, Iss. 6, p.

438. Figure 1 of Leon 1 shows the local computer attached to the Internet or other networks.

Woodcock et al., p. 312, defines a node as a device that is connected to a network and is capable of communicating with other network devices. So, the local computer in Leon 1 is a node.

Therefore, Leon 1 further discloses a network node. Leon 1 fails to disclose a Web browser accessing an intranet web server via the internet. Vlosky et al. discloses accessing an intranet via the internet (p. 2, section entitled "Extranets"). Official notice is hereby taken of the fact that when exchanging information over the Internet, it is common for a Web browser to be used to access a Web server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the franking system of Leon 1 such that a Web browser connects the franking system to an intranet web server via the internet as disclosed by Vlosky et al. and

Art Unit: 3639

official notice. Vlosky provides motivation in that such an arrangement allows an organization to allow its partner organizations to view information on its intranet that is otherwise not available to outside parties (p. 2, section entitled "Extranets").

Conclusion

27. **Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular portions of the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

28. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Erb whose telephone number is (571) 272-7606. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays, 8:30 AM to 5 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3639

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nathan Erb
Examiner
Art Unit 3639

nhe


JOHN W. HAYES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER